HON'BLE SHRI G.S. SINGHVI, THE CHIEF JUSTICE
AND
HON'BLE SHRI JUSTICE G.V. SEETHAPATHY

WRIT PETITION NO. 17906 OF 2006

BETWEEN

M/s Midland Industries Limited,
Hyderabad.

.....

Petitioner

And

The President,
District Forum-II,
Hyderabad & another

.....Respondents

::O R D E R ::

Counsel for the Petitioner : Shri C.S. Chakravarthy

Dated: 30.08.2006

Per G.S. SINGHVI, CJ

This petition is directed against order dated 12.07.2006

passed by District Consumer Disputes Redressal Forum-II, Hyderabad (for short 'the District Forum') in I.A.No.284 of 2006 in E.A.No.300 of 2005 whereby the petitioner was directed to comply with order dated 20-4-2000 passed in C.D.No.1611 of 1998.

The Facts:

Respondent No.2 - Smt. B.V. Sowjanya Devi purchased five Midas Gold Bonds of Rs.2,500/- each from the petitioner. The same were encashable on 20.01.1998, but the petitioner suo motu extended the period of bonds from 21.01.1998 to 20.10.1998. Even thereafter, the petitioner did not pay the amount due to respondent No.2. Therefore, she filed a complaint under Section 12 of the Consumer Protection Act, 1986 (for short 'the 1986 Act') and prayed that the opposite party (petitioner herein) may be directed to pay Rs.16,560/- with interest at the rate of 24% and costs and compensation. The same was registered as C.D.No.1611 of 1998. By an order dated 20.04.2000, the District Forum allowed the complaint and directed the petitioner to pay a sum of Rs.16,560/- to respondent No.2 with interest at the rate of 23%.

The petitioner challenged the order of the District Forum by filing an appeal under Section 15 of the 1986 Act. The same was registered as F.A.No. 499 of 2000. By an order dated 24-4-2001, the Andhra Pradesh State Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission (for short 'the State Commission') stayed the operation of the order of the District Forum. After hearing the parties, the State Commission, vide its order dated 28.04.2004, dismissed the appeal. The petitioner did not challenge that order

either by filing revision before the National Consumer Commission or a writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. Therefore, the order passed by the District Forum, which was confirmed by the State Commission will be deemed to have become final.

In the meanwhile, respondent No.2 filed execution petition, which was registered as P.P.No. 43 of 2000. By an order dated 10.08.2004, the District Forum, after taking cognizance of order dated 16.03.2004 passed by the Board of Industrial and Financial Reconstruction (BIFR) in Case No. 358 of 1999 whereunder settlement of unsecured loans was directed to be made in 5 yearly installments commencing from 01.01.2005, dismissed the Execution Petition as premature. After 4 months, respondent No.2 filed another execution petition, which was registered as E.A.No.300 of 2005. On notice, the petitioner filed I.A.No.284 of 2006 before the District Forum for grant of permission to deposit 1/5th of the principal amount due to respondent No.2 together with interest at the rate of 10% for the period from 01.04.2004 to 31.12.2005. After hearing the parties and by relying on the decision of the National Commission reported in **Sneha Dyechem Ltd. v. Smt. Jyothi Rathore**[1], the District Forum passed the impugned order whereby it dismissed the I.A. filed by the petitioner and directed the petitioner to comply with order passed in C.D.No.1611 of 1998 within one month.

Learned counsel for the petitioner argued that in view of the scheme sanctioned by the BIFR in terms of Section 18 of the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985 (for short 'the

1985 Act'), the petitioner cannot be compelled to pay the total amount due to respondent No.2 in terms of order dated 20.04.2000 passed by the District Forum. Learned counsel submitted that the scheme sanctioned by the BIFR has the effect of overriding the judgments and decrees passed by the judicial fora including District Forum and State Commission, and, therefore, the order under challenge is liable to be quashed.

We have given serious thought to the arguments of the learned counsel, but have not felt impressed. In our opinion, the scheme framed by BIFR cannot override order dated 20.04.2000 passed by the District Forum, which was confirmed by the State Commission, because the same has acquired finality. It is trite to say that even the Legislature cannot enact law, which has the effect of overriding the judicial verdict unless substratum of the verdict is removed. Therefore, the scheme framed by BIFR cannot be relied for nullifying the effect of the orders passed by the District Forum and the State Commission. For the same reason, we hold that the non-abstante clause contained in Section 32 of the 1985 Act is also not available to the petitioner for avoiding compliance of order dated 20.04.2000 passed by the District Forum.

There is another reason for our disinclination to entertain the petitioner's challenge to the order passed by the District Forum namely availability of an effective alternative remedy by way of appeal under Section 15 of the 1986 Act. That section lays down that a person aggrieved by an order made by the District Forum may prefer an appeal against such order to the State Commission

within a period of 30 days from the date of order. Proviso to Section 15 empowers the State Commission to condone delay in filing the appeal, if sufficient cause is shown for that purpose. The remedy available to the petitioner by way of appeal has to be treated as an effective alternative remedy because that section forms part of the scheme of the 1986 Act and there is no extra-ordinary reason for us to make a departure from the settled law that the High Court will not entertain writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, if an effective alternative remedy is available to the petitioner.

For the reasons stated above, the writ petition is dismissed. However, it is made clear that the dismissal of the writ petition shall not preclude the petitioner from filing an appeal under Section 15 of the 1986 Act.

As a sequel to dismissal of the writ petition, W.P.M.P.No.22465 of 2006 filed by the petitioner for interim relief is also dismissed.

G.S. SINGHVI, CJ

G.V. SEETHAPATHY, J

30.08.2006
ksld/GRR

---

[1] 2006 (3) ALT 30 (NC) (CPA)